

## Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated January 30, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Claims 26, 31, 33, 35, 37, 44 and 47 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

### 103 Rejections

Claims 26-50 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Sayko (US Pat 6,418,210) in view of Rozenblit (US Pat 5,832,072). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to the extent that they apply to the currently pending claims.

### Claims 26-30

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature recited by claim 26. For example, claim 26 recites, “redirecting the communication originally directed to the called number to the out-of-network entity.”

The Office Action contends that Sayko describes forwarding a communication outside a network to an out-of-network entity. Sayko describes a gateway for connecting a VoIP network to a PSTN. The gateway described by Sayko forwards a call originating from a terminal on the VoIP network to a terminal outside of the VoIP network connected to the PSTN. However, Sayko only describes forwarding a call to a terminal outside of the VoIP network where the terminal that the call is forwarded to is the terminal that the call was originally directed to. Sayko fails to describe redirecting the call originally directed to a called terminal to an out-of-network entity. This is in contrast to claim 26 which recites redirecting a communication originally directed to a called number to an out-of-network entity.

Rozenblit describes a method for a central office to receive a communication with complete calling line information and the delivery of only partial calling line information to a called party. Rozenblit further describes a method to allow a called party to associate a name to the partial calling line information such that upon subsequent calls from the

calling party the selected name is delivered to the called party. However, Rozenblit fails to describe redirecting a communication originally directed to a called number to an out-of-network entity as recited by claim 26. Therefore, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature of claim 26 such that claim 26 is allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for at least the same reasons as claim 26

The combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe an additional feature recited by claim 26. For example, claim 26 recites, “determining that the communication is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity.”

Neither Sayko nor Rozenblit concerns a communication that was originally directed to a particular number or destination and redirected to a different number or destination. Thus, it follows that neither Sayko nor Rozenblit describes determining that a communication is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity. Hence, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe this additional feature of claim 26 such that claim 26 is allowable over Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are also allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason.

#### Claims 31-34

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature recited by claim 31. For example, claim 31 recites, “redirecting the incoming communication originally directed to the called number to the entity external to the network.”

The Office Action contends that Sayko describes forwarding a communication outside a network to an entity external to the network. Sayko describes a gateway for connecting a VoIP network to a PSTN. The gateway described by Sayko forwards a call originating from a terminal on the VoIP network to a terminal outside of the VoIP network connected to the PSTN. However, Sayko only describes forwarding a call to a terminal outside of the VoIP network where the terminal that the call is forwarded to is

the terminal that the call was originally directed to. Sayko fails to describe redirecting the call originally directed to a called terminal to an entity external to the network. This is in contrast to claim 31 which recites redirecting a communication originally directed to a called number to an entity external to the network.

Rozenblit describes a method for a central office to receive a communication with complete calling line information and the delivery of only partial calling line information to a called party. Rozenblit further describes a method to allow a called party to associate a name to the partial calling line information such that upon subsequent calls from the calling party the selected name is delivered to the called party. However, Rozenblit fails to describe redirecting a communication originally directed to a called number to an entity external to the network as recited by claim 31. Therefore, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature of claim 31 such that claim 31 is allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit. Claims 32-34 depend from claim 31 and are allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for at least the same reasons as claim 31

The combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe an additional feature recited by claim 31. For example, claim 31 recites, “determining that the incoming communication is to be redirected to the entity external to the network.”

Neither Sayko nor Rozenblit concerns a communication that was originally directed to a particular number or destination and redirected to a different number or destination. Thus, it follows that neither Sayko nor Rozenblit describes determining that a communication is to be redirected to an entity external to the network. Hence, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe this additional feature of claim 31 such that claim 31 is allowable over Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason. Claims 32-34 depend from claim 31 and are also allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason.

The combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe another additional feature recited by claim 31. For example, claim 31 recites, “removing the private communication information from the communication and storing the private communication information, due to determining that that communication is to be

redirected to the entity external to the network.”

Sayko describes removing communication information from a call that is forwarded from the VoIP network to the PSTN. However, the removal of the call information described by Sayko is performed as a matter of course. The information is removed from every call because the PSTN cannot handle the information when the gateway connects the call from the VoIP network to the PSTN. The removal of the information is not due to any determination nor is it due to any determination concerning the identity of the called terminal. This is in contrast to claim 31 which recites that the removal of the private communication information from the communication is due to the determination that the communication is to be redirected to the entity external to the network.

Rozenblit describes a central office that receives a communication with complete calling line information and that the central office can deliver partial calling line information to a called party. However, Rozenblit fails to describe that the delivery of the partial calling line information is due to a determination that the call is to be redirected to a party other than the called party. This is contrast to claim 31 which recites the removal of private communication information due to a determination that the communication is to be redirected to an entity external to the network. Hence, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe this additional feature of claim 31 such that claim 31 is allowable over Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason. Claims 32-34 depend from claim 31 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 31.

#### Claims 35-43

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature recited by claim 35. For example, claim 35 recites, “redirects the call originally directed to the called number to the out-of-network entity.”

The Office Action contends that Sayko describes forwarding a call outside a network to an out-of-network entity. Sayko describes a gateway for connecting a VoIP network to a PSTN. The gateway described by Sayko forwards a call originating from a terminal on the VoIP network to a terminal outside of the VoIP network connected to the

PSTN. However, Sayko only describes forwarding a call to a terminal outside of the VoIP network where the terminal that the call is forwarded to is the terminal that the call was originally directed to. Sayko fails to describe redirecting the call originally directed to a called terminal to an out-of-network entity. This is in contrast to claim 35 which recites redirecting a call originally directed to a called number to an out-of-network entity.

Rozenblit describes a method for a central office to receive a communication with complete calling line information and the delivery of only partial calling line information to a called party. Rozenblit further describes a method to allow a called party to associate a name to the partial calling line information such that upon subsequent calls from the calling party the selected name is delivered to the called party. However, Rozenblit fails to describe redirecting a call originally directed to a called number to an out-of-network entity as recited by claim 35. Therefore, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature of claim 35 such that claim 35 is allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit. Claims 36-43 depend from claim 35 and are allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for at least the same reasons as claim 35

The combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe an additional feature recited by claim 35. For example, claim 35 recites, “determines that a call originally directed to a called number is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity.”

Neither Sayko nor Rozenblit concerns a call that was originally directed to a particular number or destination and redirected to a different number or destination. Thus, it follows that neither Sayko nor Rozenblit describes determining that a call is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity as recited by claim 35. Hence, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe this additional feature of claim 35 such that claim 35 is allowable over Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason. Claims 36-43 depend from claim 35 and are also allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason.

#### Claims 44-46

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature recited by claim 44. For example, claim 44 recites, “redirecting the communication originally directed to the called number to the out-of-network entity.”

The Office Action contends that Sayko describes forwarding a communication outside a network to an out-of-network entity. Sayko describes a gateway for connecting a VoIP network to a PSTN. The gateway described by Sayko forwards a call originating from a terminal on the VoIP network to a terminal outside of the VoIP network connected to the PSTN. However, Sayko only describes forwarding a call to a terminal outside of the VoIP network where the terminal that the call is forwarded to is the terminal that the call was originally directed to. Sayko fails to describe redirecting the call originally directed to a called terminal to an out-of-network entity. This is in contrast to claim 44 which recites redirecting a communication originally directed to a called number to an out-of-network entity.

Rozenblit describes a method for a central office to receive a communication with complete calling line information and the delivery of only partial calling line information to a called party. Rozenblit further describes a method to allow a called party to associate a name to the partial calling line information such that upon subsequent calls from the calling party the selected name is delivered to the called party. However, Rozenblit fails to describe redirecting a communication originally directed to a called number to an out-of-network entity as recited by claim 44. Therefore, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature of claim 44 such that claim 44 is allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit. Claims 45-46 depend from claim 44 and are allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for at least the same reasons as claim 44

The combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe an additional feature recited by claim 44. For example, claim 44 recites, “determines that a call originally directed to a called number is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity.”

Neither Sayko nor Rozenblit concerns a communication that was originally

directed to a particular number or destination and redirected to a different number or destination. Thus, it follows that neither Sayko nor Rozenblit describes determining that a communication is to be redirected to an out-of-network entity as recited by claim 44. Hence, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe this additional feature of claim 44 such that claim 44 is allowable over Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason. Claims 45-46 depend from claim 44 and are also allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason.

#### Claims 47-50

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature recited by claim 47. For example, claim 47 recites, “means for redirecting the communication originally directed to an in-network called number to an entity external to the network.”

The Office Action contends that Sayko describes forwarding a communication outside a network to an out-of-network entity. Sayko describes a gateway for connecting a VoIP network to a PSTN. The gateway described by Sayko forwards a call originating from a terminal on the VoIP network to a terminal outside of the VoIP network connected to the PSTN. However, Sayko only describes forwarding a call to a terminal outside of the VoIP network where the terminal that the call is forwarded to is the terminal that the call was originally directed to. Sayko fails to describe redirecting the call originally directed to a called terminal to an out-of-network entity. This is in contrast to claim 47 which recites redirecting a communication originally directed to an in-network called number to an entity external to the network.

Rozenblit describes a method for a central office to receive a communication with complete calling line information and the delivery of only partial calling line information to a called party. Rozenblit further describes a method to allow a called party to associate a name to the partial calling line information such that upon subsequent calls from the calling party the selected name is delivered to the called party. However, Rozenblit fails to describe redirecting a communication originally directed to a called number to an entity external to the network as recited by claim 47. Therefore, the combination of

Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe each and every feature of claim 47 such that claim 47 is allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit. Claims 48-50 depend from claim 47 and are allowable over the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit for at least the same reasons as claim 47

The combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe an additional feature recited by claim 47. For example, claim 47 recites, “means for determining that a communication originally directed to a called number is to be redirected outside of the network.”

Neither Sayko nor Rozenblit concerns a communication that was originally directed to a particular number or destination and redirected to a different number or destination. Thus, it follows that neither Sayko nor Rozenblit describes determining that a communication is to be redirected to outside of a network as recited by claim 47. Hence, the combination of Sayko and Rozenblit fail to describe this additional feature of claim 47 such that claim 47 is allowable over Sayko and Rozenblit for this additional reason. Claims 48-50 depend from claim 47 and are also allowable for these additional reasons.

#### Conclusion

Applicant submits that the application including claims 26-50 are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.



No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2009

/Daniel J. Layden/

Daniel J. Layden  
Reg. No. 60,921

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, GA 30007-1355  
(770) 643-8912